


Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 were rejected by the Patent Office as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Sosan (US 5,624,071) in further view of Ogilvie et al. (US 6,344,796). Claims 5 and 10 were rejected by the Patent Office as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Sosan in view of Ogilvie and in further view of Nishiyama et al (US 3,689,155).

The Patent Office acknowledges that Sosan “does not specifically disclose automatically registering the placement of the parcel within the secure receptacle after the securing step” (claim 1, step (f)) and does not specifically disclose “wherein the registering step is in response to and contemporaneously with the securing step,” but contends that Sosan discloses “using a bar code scanner to decode a combination and use this combination to deliver a package.” For the features missing in Sosan, the Patent Office cites to Ogilvie and states that the motivation for modifying Sosan is to keep a record of the package that was delivered.

Response to § 103(a) Rejection of Claims

The Patent Office contends that step (f), the automatic parcel registration within the secure receptacle, is not “specifically” disclosed in Sosan. In fact, Sosan does not hint or suggest at such a step. The bar code of Sosan to which the Patent Office refers is to decode information that is used to deliver a package, and not for automatically registering the delivery of a package into a secure receptacle “by communicating placement data concerning the placement of the parcel within the secure receptacle over a communication link.” Sosan’s teachings are insufficient to disclose or

{W:\02849\000G277000\00390514.DOC }

Appl. No.: 09/454,770
Amdt. Dated March 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 29, 2004

